

REMARKS

The Office Action, dated June 12, 2007, has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. The present amendment modifies claims 1, 10-12, 20, 27, 38-43, 53-55, 63, 70, 81, 82, 91-93, 101, 108, 119, 120, 130-132, 140, 147 and 158, and adds new claims 165-168, all in accordance with the originally-filed specification. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-168 remain in this application, and claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 are in independent form. Applicant submits that the amended claims more clearly demonstrate the novel and non-obvious differences between the present invention and the cited prior art.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-164 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-42 of co-pending Application No. 09/869,513 to Applicant. Respectfully, Applicant again notes that this rejection is provisional, and therefore will address this matter when the conflicting claims in the co-pending application have been patented.

Claims 1-164 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salesky et. al. (6,343,313) (hereinafter the Salesky patent). In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims, as well as the following remarks, Applicant requests reconsideration of these rejections.

Amended Claims Discussion

The Applicant has carefully considered the references of the Examiner. The Applicant has first modified all independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 to further clarify the technical environment of the web browser computers used by the clients with the central website server – further explanatory of the hosted central website processing topology. The

web browser computers are: “the at least one meeting planner client with a web browser computer” or “the at least one administrator with a web browser computer” in the appropriate claims, and “the at least one attendee client with a web browser computer”. References to this topology limitation can be found initially set forth in the Abstract (*see* field (57)) of the Applicant’s published application US 2001/0014865 (hereinafter “application” or “specification”)) with: “meeting planner clients, exhibitor/sponsor clients and attendee clients, all using web browser computers and a central website server on the Internet”.

Similarly, the Applicant has next modified dependent claims 10, 11, 20, 27, 41, 42, 53, 54, 63, 70, 91, 92, 101, 108, 130, 131, 140 and 147 to further clarify the technical environment of the web browser computers used by the exhibitor clients with the central website server – further explanatory of the hosted central website processing topology. Consistently throughout the Applicant’s published specification (*see* US 2001/0014865 A1), as well as referenced in the above previous paragraph, the exhibitor client is in fact distinctly presented as “exhibitor/sponsor clients”. The singular form can also be found in many areas including: col. 1, paragraphs [0007], [0012], and [0014]; col. 2, paragraph [0029]; and, col. 3, paragraphs [0031] and [0033]. And at col. 5, paragraph [0094] the “exhibitor/sponsor client” processing is explained with: “Similarly, the exhibitor/sponsor client support program instructions 900 on the central website server 200 assist the exhibitor/sponsor client 103 in determining what conventions are appropriate for their participation, and in ordering and setting up a booth (or booths) and sponsorship at a convention in the virtual convention venue databases 300”. (emphasis added). Therefore, all appropriate dependent claims 10, 11, 20, 27, 41, 42, 53, 54, 63, 70, 91, 92, 101, 108, 130, 131, 140, and 147 have been amended to now include this “exhibitor/sponsor client” phrase and the use of a “with a web browser computer” phrase by way of: “exhibitor client with a web browser computer, sponsor client

with a web browser computer or any combination thereof", or the appropriate plural form with "exhibitor clients with web browser computers, sponsor clients with web browser computers or any combination thereof". Appropriately, claims 12, 55, 93 and 132, which are dependent to presently-amended claims 10, 53, 91 and 130 respectively, are directed to the storing of cross-referencing fields to permit a one-to-many database relationship between the convention and the preceding-registered exhibitor clients or sponsor clients, have been similarly amended to read: "exhibitor clients, sponsor clients or any combination thereof".

Next, the independent claims have been modified with respect to the term "policies". To provide additional clarification of the "policies" of the present invention, the "policies" have now been more fully amended to read "a plurality of convention hosting activity policies", and for the singular case with "at least one convention hosting activity policy". References to "convention activity" are thorough and can be found initially set forth in the Abstract (*see* field (57)) of the Applicant's published application with: "wide array of convention activity simulated with the program instructions and the databases." (emphasis added). Further references have been fully detailed in the application and include FIG. 4; col 1, paragraph [0013]; col 2, paragraph [0016]; col 6, paragraph [0097]; and, col 13, paragraph [0182]. Also, references for "policies" have also been detailed in the prior amendments and remarks to this application. Making use of the term "convention activity policies" also corroborates the extensive business method characteristics of the claims; thus, the "convention activity policies" enforce the participation in convention activity by the central website server system processing.

The meeting planner or administrator can also select and input just one of these various convention activity policies that can determine the convention activity processing at the server; thus, the receipt at the server can be singular form, "at least one

convention activity policy”. The originally-filed specification supports the use of a single convention activity policy determining participation in convention activity – in this case attendance activity - at col 12, paragraph [0172] of the Applicant’s specification with: “For example, cyber exhibit booth display 715 OR the venue-based center "attendance" may be "free" or the attendee client 101 can pay via a credit card or other Internet common payment approaches.” (emphasis added). In this specific example, the convention activity policy determining the attendance activity can be either free or fee-based - which could, if necessary (e.g., fee-based), at the appropriate point launch a registration process of website program instructions at the server prior to continuing on to other virtual convention venue processes.

Process step c. (and appropriately process step d. of claim 39) of all independent claims have also been amended to read “processing the selection at the central website server by virtual convention venue website program instructions”. (emphasis added). We find extensive specifications supporting the use of “virtual convention venue website program instructions” including column 5, paragraph [0092] of the Applicant’s specification with “FIG. 4 illustrates a block diagram of the virtual convention venue website programs instructions 400.” Review of FIG. 4 at arrow 400 illustrates five sitemap flow diagrams specifications of the 500, 600, 700, 800 and 900 “program instructions”. Then, on FIG. 5, which “illustrates a sitemap flow diagram of the attendee client global searches and control program instructions in accordance with this invention” [col 2, paragraph 0025], at specification point 501, we read again the higher-level specification terms “virtual convention venue”.

Therefore, all independent claims have been amended. First, the “policies” within process step a. of the independent claims 1, 39 and 40 has been more fully amended for “a plurality of convention ~~hosting~~ activity policies” - thus amending the step to read in its

entirety “receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client with a web browser computer, and electronically storing in virtual convention venue databases at a central website server for providing central website server system processing, a plurality of convention ~~hosting~~ activity policies and convention content information for a plurality of conventions.” Subsequently, process step c. (and appropriately process step d. of claim 39) have been amended to include “processing the selection at the central website server by virtual convention venue website program instructions using at least one of the plurality of convention ~~hosting~~ activity policies”. To appropriately continue this amendment approach, process steps a. and c. of independent claim 40 have similarly been amended. Finally, independent claims 82 and 120 have been similarly amended, and also changed from plural form to singular form with “~~a plurality of~~ at least one convention ~~hosting activity policies~~ policy” within process steps a., and “using the at least one ~~of the plurality of~~ convention ~~hosting activity policies~~ policy” within process steps c. respectively.

Dependent claims 38, 81, 119 and 158 have been amended to read: “wherein the convention content information is convention and visitor bureau content information”. The convention and visitor bureau content information is specified several times in the application including at FIG. 3, database 370; col 3, paragraph [0039] with “convention and visitors bureau (“CVB”) hosts databases”; at col 5, paragraph [0085] and paragraph [0090]; col 6, paragraph [0100]; and, col 9, paragraph [0142]. These referenced convention and visitor bureau specifications and further details also provide the basis for two new dependent claims - claims 165 and 166 – “wherein the convention activity is convention and visitor bureau activity”.

Finally, two more new dependent claims have been added (claims 167-168) to address precise convention association membership features. Please note FIG. 7A, Steps 735,

736; col 11, paragraph [0165]; and, col 12, paragraph [0178] with: “The membership 735 program control and page display directs the attendee client 101 to "join" the association that is holding the specific convention. A wide selection of association membership-type information from the virtual convention venue databases 300 is provided. Become a member 736 program control and processing is similar to the registration desk 610 program; links are provided. Membership fees and policies concerning the attendee client 101 joining the association is set up by the meeting planner client 102 in meeting planner client support-program instructions 800.” (emphasis added).

These above amendments to the Applicant’s claims are responsive to the Examiner’s citations and comments, and demonstrate the novel and non-obvious nature of the presently-claimed invention.

None of the Cited Prior Art Teaches or
Suggests the Novel Features of the Independent Claims

In paragraph 8 of the present Office Action, the Examiner cited several references that allegedly suggest the features of the independent claims of the application; these are: (col 29, lines 62-63 and col 30, lines 15-24, potential conferee); (col 9, lines 64-67, col 30, lines 15-64); (fig 23); (fig 1, col 24, lines 66-67 – col 35, lines 1-10, and col 29, lines 34-37, several meetings); (17, 15, fig 2, col 8, lines 34-41); (fig 23, col 4, lines 30-44); (to determine that a client has sufficient computing resources requires processing of control parameters at the time of setup keys can be specified, col 2, lines 7-15; col 2, lines 66-67; col 3, lines 1-23; lines 50-58); (17, 14, fig 2 and fig 23, col 7, lines 10-20; col 8, lines 34-45, server provides information that allows attendee client conferencing software to start and connect to the conference). Finally, within the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the

Examiner has noted a motivation of “electronic publishing of a website for a specific event for a predetermined period.”

In order to directly attend to the Examiner’s citations and comments, certain claims have been modified; and, these changes are fully detailed and referenced to the application in the above Amended Claims Discussion section.

Within Paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner initially references (col 29, lines 62-63 and col 30, lines 15-24, potential conferee) with respect to Applicant’s “receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client”. Please note that the amended claim now reads: “receiving from the at least one meeting planner client with a web browser computer”. The Applicant also takes note of the importance of reference (column 30, lines 15-24) and its use multiple times by the Examiner; therefore, this reference is reviewed in considerable detail below.

At first referenced at column 29, lines 62-63 of the Salesky patent we read: “When server manager 36 receives a command from meeting manager 32 that includes the information on a meeting”. Both the server manager 36 and meeting manager 32 of this reference are within the description of Fig. 11 of the Salesky patent. “Fig. 11 is a diagram of the example architecture for a single server with a single meeting, according to the present invention” (col 6, lines 9-11). The first portion of this reference - “When server manager 36 receives a command from meeting manager 32 that includes the information on a meeting...” – pertains to the architecture of the single server and is specified at column 29, lines 44-51 with “The primary component of this architecture is a server manager 36 (identified in this diagram as “ServMgr ‘InfoPass’”), which is directed by a meeting manager 32 (identified in this diagram as “MeetMgr ‘the company’”). Meeting manager 32 is an unowned, quiescent,

resident, interrupt-driven process (similar to a "daemon" process used with Unix and other operating systems)." (emphasis added).

And further review of Fig. 11 depicts and legends both Meeting manager 32 and Server manager 36 within "Example of server architecture". Hence, both Meeting manager 32 and Server manager 36 are processes pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS); and just below, at column 29, lines 65-66, we read that "The CSS is an owned, evanescent, quiescent, interrupt-driven process." (emphasis added). And at the beginning of the Salesky patent, at column 2, lines 24-27, we read the definition of "meeting" with: "In the description below, a conferencing or other communications session provided by the present invention will sometimes be called a 'meeting'." (emphasis added). Therefore, the reference (col 29, lines 62-63) is directed solely to system command processes between the Meeting manager 32 process and the Server manager 36 process within and pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS). Thus, the Meeting manager 32 process of the Salesky patent is not the same as the "meeting planner client" and "the at least one meeting planner client with a web browser computer" used in the amended claims.

Continuing with the second portion of the reference (col 30, lines 15-24, potential conferee), which appears several times within the Office Action, we read: "A potential conferee 17(a) has navigated his or her WWW browser to Web server 30(a), and has asked through the Web page presented to connect to the meeting (as described above in the discussion of FIG. 2). There may be alternative ways, indicated here as 30(b),(c), to connect to the meeting, including direct access to the meeting manager or its database 34 (called here "Meeting DB"). The meeting manager uses this database to hold information concerning the meeting (the database need not be on the same computer as the meeting manager)."

Looking at the opening sentence of this reference we read: “A potential conferee 17(a) has navigated his or her WWW browser to Web server 30(a), and has asked through the Web page presented to connect to the meeting (as described above in the discussion of FIG. 2).” Fig. 2 is a drawing showing “a flowchart illustrating the connection of a conferee client computer to a conference server...” (col 4, lines 52-53). Inspection of Fig. 2 of the Salesky patent, the Examiner can observe from the START at Conferee client 17, that the scheme for (conferee locates a conference listing) is illustrated by the very first flowchart box – “Conferee locates WWW URL for a conference”. Notably, this flowchart method box is depicted wholly within the Conferee client 17 without any arrows showing communication to the Conference server 14. Fig. 2 shows the first connection arrow to Conference server 14 in the third box down in the Conferee client 17 process – “Conferee points browser to conference URL, provides keyword if needed” - well after the conference URL has already been located from outer-(conference server 14) sources, or simply “being told a URL...” (col 8, line 36).

Looking again at the Fig. 2 flowchart, we see that once the Conferee client 17 is validated on Conference server 14, the arrow first comes back to the Conferee client 17 and “initiates system client software” bringing into being the unique communicants machines with a relay software component. This conferee software for the presenter client can be found throughout the Salesky patent, summarized at column 2, lines 29-34 with “Conferencing software on the presenter client computer captures a portion of the screen display of the presenter client and sends the captured region (after possibly compressing it or applying other transformations) to the conference server.” Then the attendee client software at column 2, lines 39-43, with “to begin the conferencing session for that attendee, this action initiates the attendee client conferencing software. The attendee client then obtains a current

view of the captured region from the conference server.” Further, once the workstation of the Salesky system is initiated into the unique communicants machines and engaged in the Presenter Client Capture Operation (col 10, line 28 – col 11, line 18), they are no longer web browser computers that can be processed by virtual convention website program instructions as specified by the Applicant’s claimed invention.

Continuing now past the opening sentence of this cited reference, which specifically quoted “the discussion of Fig. 2”, we then read: “There may be alternative ways, indicated here as 30(b),(c), to connect to the meeting, including direct access to the meeting manager or its database 34 (called here “Meeting DB”). The meeting manager uses this database to hold information concerning the meeting (the database need not be on the same computer as the meeting manager).” Review of 30(b) and 30(c) on Fig. 11 of the Salesky patent depicts “Alternate connector” and “Another alternate connector” respectively. The term “connector” (“alternate connector”, etc.) is not found within the description of the Salesky patent. And, references “30(b),(c)” (nor “30(b)” and “30(c)”, etc.) appear only in this solitary sentence. Review of the symbol used for 30(b) and 30(c) provides no clarification of these Alternate connectors; and, the symbol-shape used for 30(b) and 30(c) does not appear in the Fig. 11 Legend nor any other legends of the drawings within the Salesky patent. Significantly, the “Another alternate connector 30(c)” is not defined as a server or a client.

With the immediately prior quoting of Fig. 2, 30(c) may perhaps be another means of downloading a client utility to connect to the server – but the reader is provided no enabling disclosure. With reasoning, this “Another alternate connector 30(c)” may perhaps be a similar process pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS) as found in the Meeting manager (32) processes pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS). “Another alternate connector 30(c)” may be a similar-type process like Meeting manager 32

with a “connection” to Meeting DB 34. Regardless, the unsubstantiated use of the term “connector” and the lack of explanations with respect to “Alternate connectors 30(b),(c)” in general, and “Another alternate connector 30(c)” and its connection to the Meeting DB (34) in particular, does not provide adequate basis to compare them to the Applicant’s elements and claimed invention, as amended - including “the at least one meeting planner client with a web browser computer”, “a central website server for providing central website server system processing”, “the at least one attendee client with a web browser computer”, “virtual convention venue website program instructions”. Respectfully, “Alternate connectors 30(b),(c)” lack any suggestion that they can be modified in a manner required to meet the amended claims of the Applicant.

Thus, Applicant asserts that the first portion of the reference (col 29, lines 62-63) is directed solely to system command processes between the Meeting manager 32 process and the Server manager 36 process within and pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS); and, Meeting manager 32 of the Salesky patent is not a “meeting planner client” nor comparable to “the at least one meeting planner client with a web browser computer” of the Applicant’s claimed invention. The second part of this initial reference (col 30, lines 15-24, potential conferee) pertains to the system command processes interconnected with the CSS of the Salesky patent. Further, within the opening sentence of this precise reference, the Salesky patent cites, with “as described above in the discussion of Fig. 2).” (emphasis added) (col 30, lines 17-18), which addresses the specification and first steps that initiate the communicants machines of the potential conferee with a relay and data block transformation software component – necessary initializing and operating elements to engage on a full-time basis the specialized communicants machines of the Salesky patent that are not necessary or the same in the Applicant’s invention.

Applicant further asserts that the unsubstantiated use of the term “connector” and the lack of disclosure with respect to “Alternate connectors 30(b),(c)” does not teach any details, nor suggest the desirability of being a detached conferee, nor suggest the desirability of conferee operations without first initiating and engaging a communicant machine. Taken as a whole, the reference (col 29, lines 62-63 and col 30, lines 15-24, potential conferee), which describes in considerable detail a necessary communicants machine to engage the potential conferee in the Salesky system, is not comparable with respect to Applicant’s “receiving from the at least one meeting planner client with a web browser computer”. And, the Salesky patent lacks any suggestion that this reference should be modified in a manner required to meet the amended independent claims of the Applicant.

Another way of taking into consideration the differentiation between the unique communicants machines engaged by the system of the Salesky patent TO the web browser computers in the system and claims of the Applicant, is if one were to eliminate any one of the unique relay machines and replace it with a web browser computer in the Salesky system – then the “computer conferencing system” technology of the Salesky patent cannot work; hence, the Applicant’s invention is not comparable to the Salesky patent. Later herein below, we will also show and argue that when the communicants machines of the Salesky patent are simultaneously engaged, they cannot be available to interface with the virtual convention venue website program instructions of the Applicant’s claimed invention.

Next, the Examiner references (col 9, lines 64-67, col 30, lines 15-64) with respect to Applicant’s “and electronically storing in virtual convention venue databases at a central website server for providing central website server system processing.” At referenced column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 3 of the Salesky patent we first read: “In some cases, server 14 might be operating without attendees. Such a configuration is useful where

the presenter wishes to “record” a session for later playback. Even a session with attendees can be recorded for later playback, possibly including a recording of the voice conferencing. These stored sessions might be stored in session archive 23 or elsewhere.” And column 30, lines 15-64 is a continuation of the previous paragraph lines (col 30, lines 15-24) above referenced by the Examiner.

Applicant argues that the referenced process is not comparable to the technology of the present invention. In the Salesky patent, the Presenter client computer 12, initiated as a distinctive communicants machine with, as we now further discern for engaging in communications, a decentralized synchrony in the system with relay software component and special data-blocking-unblocking utility, at the outset has to process a “capture rectangle” in combination with the Conference server 14 “in order to provide synchrony in the system” (col 7, lines 57-65). If we then read the lines immediately following the Examiner’s reference (col 9, lines 64-67), we find the synchronization again – this time the reverse processing side of the attendees but no presenter – at column 10, lines 2-7: “These stored sessions might be stored in session archive 23 or elsewhere. The shared image session can be synchronized with the voice conference by using the time stamps on the block data. When the recorded session is played back, it is an example of conference server 14 operating with attendees but no presenter”. (emphasis added). The “it is an example of conference server 14 operating” that is very specific and telling at this reference in terms of the necessary involvement in the server architecture as depicted in Fig. 11 - where conference server 14 is clearly shown with the dotted line as the Communications session server (CSS). We established earlier that all computers of potential conferee 17(a) also communicate [as specified above in the Applicant’s remarks and analysis of Examiner reference (col 30, lines 15-24)] - “in order to provide synchrony in the system” (col 7, lines 57-65). Thus, the

synchrony processing and software involved with the “‘sink’ client machines of the ‘communicants’ during a communication session” (emphasis added) (col 3, lines 57-58 of the Salesky patent) is necessary not only for the webcast-type relay process between the communicants, but also for the data block transformation and/or other communication tasks involved with the recorded session playback. Fig. 11 clearly depicts the network connection with the Computer of the conferee 17(a) and the CSS as discussed in detail directly above. The “Another alternate connector 30(c)” is not specified - as a potential conferee, a server, sub-process, communications equipment, etc. The unsubstantiated use of the term “connector” (and the lack of disclosure with respect to “Alternate connectors 30(b),(c)”) does not teach any details, nor suggest the desirability of being a conferee, nor suggest conferee operations.

We respectfully now turn to the Examiner’s reference (col 30, lines 15-64). The Applicant has previously shown above that the first three sentences of this reference (col 30, lines 15-24, potential conferee) pertains to the system command processes interconnected with the CSS of the Salesky patent. Further, within the initial introductory sentence of this sizeable referenced paragraph (i.e., col 30, lines 15-64) includes “as described above in the discussion of Fig. 2.” (emphasis added) (col 30, lines 17-18), which specifically addresses the first steps that initiate and engage the “communicants machines” of the potential conferee with a relay and data block transformation software component – necessary initializing, and followed by this now-engaged full-time operating element of the Salesky patent that are not necessary in the Applicant’s invention. The immediate continuation of the sentences within this paragraph of this reference (col 30, lines 24-64) appear to further pertain to the system command processes interconnected with the CSS of the Salesky patent and the special communication session handshake matters with respect to the support operations of the

communicants machines. Examples within this reference include (col 30, line 40, “address information for the CSS”) and (col 30, lines 47-49, “The monitoring-filtering-queueing structures and procedures of FIGS. 8A,B are performed by the CSS”). Looking back at column 29, lines 65-66, we read that “The CSS is an owned, evanescent, quiescent, interrupt-driven process.” (emphasis added); hence, it appears this current reference pertains to further support of the currently-engaged and operationally-necessary specialized communicants machines of the Salesky system.

Overall, Applicant respectfully submits that these references (col 9, lines 64-67, col 30, lines 15-64) are not comparable to Applicant’s claimed “electronically storing in virtual convention venue databases at a central website server for providing central website server system processing” at this step because the Salesky topology requires initiating, then engaging full-time, specialized communicants machines for such operation. Also, the Applicant’s claim-step-included “convention venue databases” is encoded by the meeting planner client with the data structure found within the specifications which defines functional and structural interrelationships between the meeting planner client and the attendee client, the data structure and website program instructions (e.g., computer software), and the data storage device, CPU and network interface (e.g., hardware components), which permit the data structure’s functionality to be realized without first engaging any specialized communicants machines as read in the Salesky patent. And claim-wide, these references are not comparable to Applicant’s “and electronically storing in virtual convention venue databases at a central website server for providing central website server system processing” in the amended claim limitation terms of “convention ~~hosting~~ activity policies and convention content information” received from a “meeting planner client with a web browser computer.”

The Applicant has carefully considered Fig. 23 of the Salesky patent in terms of the Applicant's invention in general, and the amended element and use language of the Applicant's claims in particular: "a plurality of convention ~~hosting~~ activity policies" in process step a.; and later, with "using at least one of the plurality of convention ~~hosting~~ activity policies to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information" in process step c. At column 6, lines 61-62 of the Salesky patent we read: "FIG. 23 is a time vs. space diagram showing some typical applications of the present invention". And at column 35, lines 19-21 we read the only other FIG. 23 use within the Salesky patent with "One way of seeing the flexibility of the system is to refer to FIG. 23, where several applications covering different separations in time and space for the communicants are listed." (emphasis added).

Within the Salesky patent, we learned that the "communicants" were first referenced at column 3, lines 56-58 with: "In the more general case, the 'communications server' connects the 'source' and 'sink' client machines of the 'communicants...'". (emphasis added). And then at column 7, lines 22-27 of the Salesky patent we read: "The presenter client conferencing software, which is usually distributed tightly bound with the attendee client software to facilitate presenter hand-offs from conferee to conferee, captures information (such as image, sound, or other output information) from a program or programs running on the presenter's machine and relays it to the server...". (emphasis added). This is a unique relay machine. We plainly see, also at column 7, line 32-33, that the relay part of the machine is a software component within the Salesky patent and refers to "transporting a stream of shared-image data during a conferencing usage...".

As maintained herein above, the Salesky patent employs dissimilar elements and topologies. The nonexistence of fundamental elements within the Salesky patent is

indicative that the claims, as amended, are not anticipated by or rendered obvious in view of this prior art reference. The Salesky patent does not expressly or inherently use “policy”, “policies”, “activity policy” or specifically the fully amended “convention hosting activity policies” of the Applicant. At column 35, lines 19-21 of the Salesky patent, we read “One way of seeing the flexibility of the system is to refer to FIG. 23, where several applications covering different separations in time and space for the communicants are listed.” (emphasis added). The Applicant submits that Fig. 23 is clearly directed to the four phases in terms of “space” and “time” of the “client machines” of the “communicants” (col 3, lines 56-58) where the: Here/Now – the client machines of the communicants are “recording and previewing a presentation”; There/Now – the client machines of the communicants are “joining a real-time conference connecting participants at different, possibly quite distant, locations”; Here/Later – the client machines of the communicants are “reviewing an archived earlier conference as a participant”; and, There/Later – the client machines of the communicants are “viewing a prerecorded presentation or reviewing an archived conference as a nonparticipant”.

The term “nonparticipant” (“non-participant”, etc.) is not found within the description of the Salesky patent. And, references of “nonparticipant” appear only in Fig. 23. With the use of the term “communicants” at the column 35, lines 19-21 description of Fig. 23, perhaps downloading of the client utility to connect to the server is required – but the reader is provided no added description. The unsubstantiated use of the term “nonparticipant” and the fact that the Salesky patent did not expressly or inherently use “policy” or “policies” does not provide adequate basis to further compare Fig. 23 to the Applicant’s amended claims - in particular: “a plurality of convention hosting activity policies” in process step a.; and, with “using at least one of the plurality of convention

hosting activity policies to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information” in process step c. Respectfully, Fig. 23 of the Salesky patent lacks any suggestion that the material can be modified in a manner required to meet the amended claims of the Applicant.

The Examiner next references (fig 1, col 24, lines 66-67 – col 35, lines 1-10, and col 29, lines 34-37, several meetings) with respect to Applicant’s “convention content information for a plurality of conventions”. It is important to note that the claim language has been modified at this step to more fully read “a plurality of convention hosting activity policies and convention content information for a plurality of conventions”. Fig. 1 of the Salesky patent “is a block diagram of a desktop conferencing system...” (col 4, lines 50-51) and at column 24, lines 66-67 we read the “the stored meeting contents, or any other document or data object might be uploaded and stored...”. As discussed herein above, relay utility aspects of the “attendee client software” and “presenter client conferencing software” at the “client machines of the communicants” also processes “stored meeting contents, or any other document” as a “data stream” before passing it into the “communications server” (col 3, lines 56-57) for further relay machine work. At column 24 line 66 through column 25 line 10 of the Salesky patent we further read the “data stream” “upload” and subsequent CSS “relay” processing with: “In addition to the stored meeting contents, any other document or data object might be uploaded and stored with the meeting (e.g., meeting agenda, minutes of a previous meeting, or supporting materials). Upload is another type of data stream that passes into the system server and is then relayed to a suitable storage entity...”. (emphasis added).

Again, the Applicant maintains that this relay “attendee client software” and “presenter client conferencing software” at the initiated and engaged “client machines of the communicants” has been omitted in the technology of the present invention. The processes

are not comparable. Further, if we consider the Salesky technology without such a relay software component at the “client machines of the communicants”, the references that were relied upon by the Examiner are inoperative in terms of the Applicant’s invention. Then, at further Examiner reference (col 29, lines 34-37, several meetings), we find: “the method to be described below can also accommodate several meetings on the same underlying hardware and the conferencing software as provided by the present invention.” (emphasis added). Just beyond this line, we take note that this reference is directed to “multiple simultaneous communications sessions” (col 29, line 40); and, at the beginning of the Salesky patent, at column 2, lines 24-27, we took into account the patent-wide definition of “meeting” with: “In the description below, a conferencing or other communications session provided by the present invention will sometimes be called a ‘meeting.’” (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully argues that “multiple simultaneous communications sessions” (col 29, line 40) is not comparable to the Applicant’s “plurality of conventions”. In total, the Examiner reference (fig 1, col 24, lines 66-67 – col 35, lines 1-10, and col 29, lines 34-37, several meetings) lacks any suggestion that the reference should be modified in a manner required to meet the Applicant’s amended claim “a plurality of convention ~~hosting~~ activity policies and convention content information for a plurality of conventions”.

Next, the Examiner references (17, 15, fig 2, col 8, lines 34-41) with respect to Applicant’s “receiving at the central website server from the at least one attendee client a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions”. (Please note that it appears “15”, fig 2 is in error in that no “15” appears on Figure 2 of the Salesky patent reference; therefore, (17, 14, fig 2) is used herein below.) All independent claims have been attended to and amended to now read: “receiving at the central

website server from the at least one attendee client with a web browser computer a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions”.

As discussed at length hereinabove, Fig. 2 of the Salesky patent clearly depicts that Conference server 14 first “initiates system client software” to the Conferee client 17, bringing into being the distinctive communicants machines. Looking again at the Fig. 2 flowchart, we see that once the Conferee client 17 is validated on Conference server 14, the arrow first comes back to the Conferee client 17 and “initiates system client software” bringing into being the unique communicants machines with a relay software component. Applicant has amended the language of process step b. of the independent claim(s) to address the Examiner’s references and to further specify differences at this point with the addition of “with a web browser computer”.

The description of Fig. 2, starts at column 8, line 30 of the Salesky patent, and includes the Examiner’s referenced column 8, lines 34-41. This reference is directed at locator services prior to connecting to Conference server 14, then at column 8, line 41-42 “allows the attendee client conferencing software to start and to connect to conference server 14 itself...”. (emphasis added). We respectfully argue that the Applicant’s claim, as amended, is “receiving, from the at least one attendee client with a web browser computer at the central website server”; and, the Salesky patent has engaged unique communicants machines with a relay and data block transformation software component – necessary elements of the Salesky patent. These client machines of the Salesky patent are not necessary nor are they equivalent as the client workstations of the Applicant’s invention.

Next, the Examiner references (fig 23, col 4, lines 30-44) with respect to Applicant’s “processing the selection at the central website server by virtual convention website program instructions using at least on of the plurality of convention hosting policies”,

in addition to the reference (to determine that a client has sufficient computing resources requires processing of control parameters at the time of setup keys can be specified, col 2, lines 7-15; col 2, lines 66-67; col 3, lines 1-23; lines 50-58) with respect to Applicant's "to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information in a virtual convention venue, a physical convention venue, or any combination thereof". All independent claims have been attended to and amended to now read: "processing the selection at the central website server by virtual convention venue website program instructions using at least one of the plurality of convention ~~hosting~~ activity policies to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information in a virtual convention venue, a physical convention venue, or any combination thereof."

As maintained herein above, Fig. 23 of the Salesky patent lacks any suggestion that the material can be modified in a manner required to meet the amended claims of the Applicant; and, the Salesky patent employs dissimilar elements and topologies in general. Further, the Salesky system initiates and engages unique communicants machines with a relay and data block transformation software component – necessary elements of the Salesky patent – prior to the conference server 14 programs dealing with "Server handles client requests, provides updates" and "handles other streams" as flowcharted at reference (17, 14, FIG. 2) of the Salesky patent. Reference (col 4, lines 30-44) addresses limitations of "existing systems" at the time of the Salesky specification that were "explained in greater detail" within the Salesky specification – all after initiation and engagement of unique communicants machines. None of those details are comparable to Applicant's "processing the selection at the central website server by virtual convention venue website program instructions using at least one of the plurality of convention ~~hosting~~ activity policies"

particularly when read in terms of the “virtual convention venue website program instructions”.

Next, we carefully consider the use of the “keys” in the Salesky patent and the Examiner’s reference: (to determine that a client has sufficient computing resources requires processing of control parameters at the time of setup keys can be specified, col 2, lines 7-15; col 2, lines 66-67; col 3, lines 1-23; lines 50-58). Within this reference, we first read at (col 2, lines 8-15) “At the time of setup, one or more password character strings ("keys") can be specified for the conference. The key that a conferee gives at the time of attempting to connect to the conference server determines whether that conferee will be allowed access to the conference and what the conferee's initial privileges will be for participating in the conference and for modifying the setup of the conference.” (emphasis added). It is important to consider these two sentences together – as the Examiner has appropriately done here; if one considers just the first sentence or simply the second sentence it can be unrepresentative. Simply stated, to connect to the conference server the conferee needs a key. Respectfully, this is not comparable with the claims of the Applicant - where the meeting planner client or the attendee client “gives at the time of attempting to connect to the conference server” such a “key”.

Within the Applicant’s claimed invention, the meeting planner pre-loads the convention activity policies out on the server. Then, when the attendee client arrives at the website he/she has no key with them. The attendee processing at the server in terms of the convention activity is based on the pre-loaded policies stored on the server within the virtual convention venue databases. It is very clear from process step a. of the independent claims that these convention activity policies are pre-loaded on the databases. Respectfully, the Salesky patent does not teach “processing the selection at the central website server by

virtual convention venue website program instructions using at least one of the plurality of convention ~~hosting~~ activity policies to determine participation in convention activity” particularly when the at least one of the convention activity is stored within the virtual convention venue databases.

Continuing, we review the Examiner’s note “to determine that a client has sufficient computing resources requires processing of control parameters at the time of setup keys can be specified” and reference (col 2, lines 66-67; col 3, lines 1-23; lines 50-58). At this reference, the Salesky patent begins: “As each conferee joins a conference, the client and the conference server agree on the capabilities of the client, such as display bit-depth, bandwidth of the connection between client and the conference server, processor speed of the client, and the amount of memory available to each client. These parameters may be modified by the conferee, the client, or the server; this can be done automatically or on demand. If the conference server determines that a client has sufficient computing resources, some of the tasks, such as image data compression (for presenter clients), decompression (for attendee clients), update scheduling (both types of clients), and other image transformations and server management functions can be assigned to the client computers.” (emphasis added). And at (lines 51-58) we read: “The features of connecting to servers, setting up conferences, keying privileges, passing identifications, accommodating multiple dissimilar platforms and network connections, and configuring subsets of conferees apply equally to these other data streams. In the more general case, the ‘communications server’ connects the ‘source’ and ‘sink’ client machines of the ‘communicants’ during a communication session.”

Respectfully, these references pertain to the system command processes interconnected with the CSS of the Salesky patent and the special image transformation and server management communication session handshakes and display/memory processing with

respect to the support operations of the engaged communicants machines during a conferencing session. The use of the term “parameters” is specifically used in a consistent manner in the Salesky patent for such processes. At column 4, lines 23-27 we read: “(for example, measured net speed and central processing unit, or ‘CPU,’ load) and facilities available (for example, announced client characteristics, such as CPU speed, compression and/or decompression hardware, or display parameters)”. (emphasis added). At column 7, lines 50-53 we further read: “The need for the two transformations is determined by the system depending on such parameters as client characteristics, server and network loading, and user requests.” (emphasis added). And please note that this is specified “During a conferencing session...”. (col 7, line 35).

At column 12, lines 50-57 we see another example of the processing of control parameters to determine that a client has sufficient computing resources with: “In FIG. 4C, the images are replaced by checksums or digests, such as cyclic redundancy check (“CRC”), DFT (discrete Fourier transform) parameters, or the results of applying hashing functions appropriate for images, or the like. Although storage is greatly reduced, as only the much smaller checksums need to be saved, and comparison is quick, the digest procedure must be fast in order to provide any time economy.” (emphasis added). Then, at column 21, lines 55-58 we find: “Discarder 144 drops blocks based on parameters about the network and client known to the server and to filter 100 as well as parameters and requests (e.g., ‘slow down,’ ‘speed up,’ or frame rate specifications) received from the client.” (emphasis added).

Respectfully, the processing of control parameters to determine that a client has sufficient computing resources, particularly in the usage terms of image transformation and server management processing to support operations of the engaged specialized communicants machines during a conferencing session, is not comparable to the Applicant’s

step “processing the selection at the central website server by virtual convention venue website program instructions using at least one of the plurality of convention hosting activity policies to determine participation in convention activity”. The processing of control parameters to determine that a client has sufficient computing resources within the Salesky patent is a unique requirement of the Salesky system related to the engagement of the unique communicants machines and their relay and data block transformation software component – necessary elements of the Salesky patent. Further the unique communicants machines with such control parameters of the Salesky patent are mandatory to meet the need of providing “[a]n improved general purpose data-stream computer network transport system...” (col 1, lines 49-50) where existing “video conferencing wastes large amounts of bandwidth...” (col 1, lines 23-24). These unique communicants machines and computing resource control parameters of the Salesky patent are not necessary nor are they equivalent to the client workstations, convention activity policies and virtual convention website program instructions of the Applicant’s invention, particularly addressing the need where “the system allows the creation of a ‘virtual convention venue’ for conventions that exist only on the central website server and available using the Internet.” (col 2, paragraph [0016]) (emphasis added).

The reader further finds that the processing of these control parameters to determine that a client has sufficient computing resources within the Salesky patent is in concert in supporting the simultaneous and synchronized operations of the Salesky system in the “Presenter Client Capture Operation” (col 10, line 28). At column 10, lines 29-31 we read: “The capture operation and transport technology improves over former approaches by reducing the amount of work required and so enhances performance.” And at column 10, lines 19-27 we find: “The conference server acts as a software-controlled switch that connects

the presenter client with the attendee clients, taking into account that the speed of information transfer from the presenter client can change and the speed of transfer to the attendee clients can change and be simultaneously different for different attendees.” (emphasis added). At column 29, lines 37-40, please read: “Again, the description of this method is not intended to suggest that this is the only way in which the invention can accomplish multiple simultaneous communications sessions.” (emphasis added). At column 31, lines 2-6 we see this simultaneous operations in a more complex three-meeting-connected method with: “Here, the server manager has created three CSSs to supervise three meetings. Conferee client 17(a) (labeled here ‘Jim’) is simultaneously connected to two meetings. If Jim is permitted, he can share the information he receives from one meeting with the participants in the other.” (emphasis added). The simultaneous connection and transfer operation is read consistently within the Salesky specification and is appropriate in terms of the needs of the Salesky patent.

Respectfully, we argue that while the unique communicants machine of the presenter client is simultaneously connected in the information transfer process to the attendee clients of the Salesky patent, a reasonable expectation of success would be unfeasible to achieve the amended claims of the Applicant’s system. These claims being, “receiving at the central website server from the at least one attendee client with a web browser computer a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions; processing the selection at the central website server by virtual convention venue website program instructions using at least one of the plurality of convention activity policies to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information in a virtual convention venue, a physical convention venue, or any combination thereof”. While simultaneously engaged in the information transfer process of the Salesky patent (with or without the client characteristics parameters helping

minimize the computing resources), receiving at the central website server from the at least one attendee client with a web browser computer a selection for convention content information and processing the selection at the central website server by virtual convention venue website program instructions, would not be workable, particularly given that the unique communicants machines are engaged. When the communicants machines of the Salesky patent are simultaneously engaged, they cannot be available to interface with the virtual convention venue website program instructions of the Applicant's claimed invention.

Next, the Examiner references (17, 14, fig 2 and fig 23, col 7, lines 10-20; col 8, lines 34-45, server provides information that allows attendee client conferencing software to start and connect to the conference) with respect to Applicant's "releasing from the central website server to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information." Please note that remarks concerning (17, 14, fig 2 and fig 23; col 8, lines 34-45) appear hereinabove.

At reference (17, 14, fig 2) above we respectfully argued that the Applicant's claim, as amended, is "receiving, from the at least one attendee client with a web browser computer at the central website server"; and, the Salesky patent has engaged unique communicants machines with a relay and data block transformation software component – necessary elements of the Salesky patent. These client machines of the Salesky patent are not necessary nor are they equivalent as the client workstations of the Applicant's invention. And in consideration with reference (col 8, lines 34-45), we noted that the FIG 2. (referred to in the cited paragraph) depicts a flowchart method box wholly within the Conferee client 17 without any arrows showing communication to the Conference server 14 where the "Conferee locates WWW URL for a conference". Fig. 2 shows the first connection arrow to Conference server 14 in the third box down in the Conferee client 17 process – "Conferee

points browser to conference URL, provides keyword if needed” - well after the conference URL has already been located from outer-(conference server 14) sources, or simply “being told a URL” (col 8, line 36). And, at reference (fig 23) above, we established that FIG. 23 - a time vs. space diagram showing some typical applications of the present invention - lacked any suggestion that the material can be modified in a manner required to meet the amended claims of the Applicant.

The description of Fig. 2, starts at column 8, line 30 of the Salesky patent, and includes the Examiner’s referenced column 8, lines 34-41. This reference is directed at locator services prior to connecting to Conference server 14, then at column 8, lines 41-43 “allows the attendee client conferencing software to start and to connect to conference server 14 itself...”. (emphasis added). We respectfully argue that conference server 14 is providing to the conferee client 17 exactly what is shown in the flowchart box on FIG. 2 with the first arrow back from conference server 14 – the box states “Conferee computer initiates system client software”. (emphasis added). We argue that the “system client software” is as presented, and not extended in terms of the Examiner’s notation “server provides information that allows attendee client conferencing software to start and connect to the conference”. Applicant respectfully points out that the “selected convention content information” of the Applicant’s specification in process step d. is not the same or comparable to the “system client software” of the Salesky patent. Finally, reference (col 7, lines 10-20) of the Salesky patent pertains to the types “users” or “groups of users” that could use the system of the Salesky patent in terms of the specifications – after initiation and engagement of unique communicants machines, while the unique communicants machines of the presenter clients are simultaneously connected in the information transfer process to the attendee clients – and is not the same or comparable to the Applicant’s process step d.

Finally, within the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Examiner has noted a motivation of “electronic publishing of a website for a specific event for a predetermined period.” (emphasis added). The Salesky patent lacks any suggestion of any electronic publishing of a website for a specific event solely with web browser skills. The Salesky patent did not expressly or inherently use “website server”, “website program”, “website program instructions”, “convention”, “convention activity”, “convention website”, “convention venue databases”, “policy” or “convention activity policy”. The lack of these features within the Salesky patent of such important website server processing elements is understandable because the Salesky technology did not anticipate a self-contained website with virtual convention website program instructions processing of a selection for convention content information from an attendee client, using a pre-loaded convention activity policy to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information, particularly as fully taught and claimed in the present application.

Further, there is also no web-page-publishing within the application as suggested by the Examiner. Clearly, the present invention is directed to the technology behind how the meeting planner client, exhibitor client or sponsor client can themselves, separately and interactively, encode a relational database with functional descriptive material and operate their distinct aspects of the central website with database updating processing and dynamic page information display, without any web-page-publishing or website programming skills, but rather solely web browser skills. The meeting planner client can also set convention activity policies to customize the operation or processing flow of the virtual navigational experience of the exhibitor clients, sponsor clients and attendee clients. The present invention provides a precise technology, where the meeting planner client (or administrator), exhibitor client or sponsor client can encode and fully maintain, at a central

website server for providing central website server system processing, with virtual convention website program instructions, single or multiple-show or virtual convention website processes. The relational database design and computer programming supporting the process of receiving such convention activity policies and convention content information and electronically storing at a central website is novel and requires nonobvious database fields and relationships, and processing steps.

The claimed invention solves many fundamental problems and introduces functions missing in early website work and patents, and is a significant contribution to the state of the art. For the foregoing reasons, none of independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120, as amended, are anticipated by or rendered obvious over the prior art of record, whether used alone or in combination. In particular, none of the Salesky patent nor any of the prior art of record teach or suggest the method and system for conducting a convention, as specifically set forth in these claims. There is no suggestion in any of the references cited by the Examiner to combine these references in a manner that would render the invention, as claimed, obvious. Reconsideration of the rejection of independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-38 and 159 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 1. Claims 41 and 42 depend directly from independent claim 40, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 40. Claims 44-81 and 160 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 43, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 43. Claims 83-119, 161 and 162 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 82,

and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 82. Claims 121-158, 163 and 164 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 120, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 120. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-38, 41 and 42, 44-81, 83-119 and 121-164 is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that claims 1-168 are patentable over the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By



Nathan J. Prepelka
Registration No. 43,016
Attorney for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818
Telephone: (412) 471-8815
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com